

Appl. No. 10/710,797
Amdt. dated November 17, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 7, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 28 and 29 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and claims 1-3, 5, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23-25, 27, 31, 37, 39, 41, 44, 47-49, 51, 56, 62-64, 66, and 69 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-27 and 30-69 are presently pending, with claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 17, 24, 25, 27, 31, 39, 47, 51, 56, and 63 being independent.

Applicant wishes to express its appreciation for the interview conducted on November 16, 2005, and thank the Examiner for her time and consideration given during that interview. It is noted that claims 1, 24, and 47 and proposed amendments to those claims were discussed during the interview. A number of changes to the specification, as well as a number of other issues (e.g., amendments to overcome the § 112 rejections, replacement of the abstract, rewriting of objected to claims, etc.), were also discussed during the interview. Moreover, it was agreed that amended claims 1, 24, and 47 (as proposed in the interview) would be patentably distinguishable over the references applied in the Action of October 7, 2005. These claims have consequently been amended herein to include the proposed amendments.

In the Office Action of October 7, 2005, claims 16, 18, 20, 37, 41, 44, 62, 64, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. As agreed during the interview, these claims have been amended herein to replace the word "can" with the wording - is permitted to - -. Claims 23 and 69 have been similarly amended. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/710,797
Amdt. dated November 17, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 7, 2005

Based upon the above-noted remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 24, and 47 are now in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 2-4, 6-9, 11, 12, and 14-16 depend from claim 1; claims 26, 30, and 32-38 depend from claim 24; and claims 48-50, 52-55, and 57-62 depend from claim 47. Thus, these dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

With regard to the remaining claims pending in the present application, claims 5, 10, 13, 17-23, 25, 27, 31, 39-46, 51, 56, and 63-69 are objected to in the Action as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As suggested in the Action, claims 5, 10, 13, 17, 25, 27, 31, 39, 51, 56, and 63 have been rewritten in independent form and should therefore be in condition for allowance. Claims 18-23 depend from claim 17, claims 40-46 depend from claim 39, and claims 64-69 depend from claim 63. Accordingly, these dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

As agreed upon during the interview, paragraphs 39-41 of the specification have been amended to clarify which component is referenced by the numeral "34." Furthermore, the abstract has been shortened as requested.

In view of the foregoing, the present application should now be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (800) 445-3460.

Appl. No. 10/710,797
Amdt. dated November 17, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 7, 2005

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge \$1100.00 to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 19-0522 for the independent claims added herein. The Commissioner is further authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP

By:



Andrew G. Colombo, Reg. No. 40,565
2405 Grand Boulevard, Suite 400
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
(816) 474-9050

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

BEST AVAILABLE COPY